

File

UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII
College of Arts and Sciences - Office of the Dean

MEMORANDUM

May 23, 1972

TO: Paul C. Yuen, Acting Chancellor
University of Hawaii - Manoa Campus

SUBJECT: President's memorandum of May 22 in regard to
Ethnic Studies.

You requested that I respond to point #2 in the President's memorandum, which concerns the criticism by Regent Chang of the procedures that led to the nomination of Mr. Lawrence Kamakawiwoole as Director of Ethnic Studies. Actually, I've already done so; and attached is a copy of my memorandum to the President in regard to this matter. At this juncture, there's little that I can add.

The President asks how the selection could be remedied if it were found to be procedurally defective. As I indicated in my memorandum to him, I don't believe there were procedural defects in the selection process. Of course, we could go through the whole process again; but the results at the program level would be the same. Or, we could invoke a different procedure, such as an ad hoc selection committee; but I'm sure those now involved in the program would strongly object. Besides, the Chancellor already has given responsibility to a committee - the People's Committee - to ^{make} a recommendation to him in regard to the directorship. That committee some time ago unanimously recommended Mr. Kamakawiwoole.

David E. Contois
David E. Contois
Dean

Attachment

UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII

College of Arts and Sciences • Office of the Dean

MEMORANDUM

May 18, 1972

TO: Harlan Cleveland, President
University of Hawaii

SUBJECT: Response to Regent Chang's Objections to the Process
of Selection of Lawrence Kamakawiwoole

At this morning's meeting of the Board of Regents, as you know, Regent Chang objected to the procedures used in the selection of Mr. Lawrence Kamakawiwoole as Director of Ethnic Studies; and on the basis of this objection, refused to vote for his confirmation as Director, resulting in the Board's inability to take action on this matter.

Quite frankly, I was distressed by Regent Chang's viewpoint; for if I understood his remarks, the bases for his objections are not valid in my view.

His major point seemed to be that the polling of the staff was carried out with undue haste and that those polled had little or no opportunity to consider alternatives. Although it is true that the staff was polled rapidly--over a period of a few days, including a weekend--all but two of the 15 staff members did respond. The two who did not, and who could not be contacted even by telephone, were graduate teaching assistants. Further, the question of the directorship had been before the staff for some time--ever since the former director resigned in late February--and the matter had been opened up for active discussion a couple of weeks before the poll as a result of the People's Committee proposal in regard to the directorship.

A second point Regent Chang made was that the selection process did not conform to established procedures as set forth in the Faculty Handbook. Again, I don't see that this objection has any basis in fact. First, there are no explicit procedures for selecting program directors set forth in the Faculty Handbook.

The procedures Regent Chang referred to are in connection with the selection of department chairmen. Second, in an early meeting of the Regents' Joint Committee on Ethnic Studies, it is my recollection that I explained to those present that the selection of directors on the basis of the precedents of past actions over a number of years could take a variety of forms, from purely administrative action to procedures similar to those used for selecting chairmen, depending on circumstances and the nature of the program. And third, as a matter of fact, the procedure used was identical to that for the selection of chairmen: the staff was polled, including each member of Rank 3 and above, and all but two responded, which is about par for the course.

The results of the poll are known to you. However, to clarify what appears to be confusion over numbers, a reiteration of the results follows:

Of the 15 staff members polled,

- 2 did not respond
- 3 did not wish to make any recommendation
- 1 nominated a Dr. Odo of Long Beach State
- 1 nominated Dr. Thomas Chang of our College of Education
- 1 nominated Dr. Dennis Ogawa, the former director
- 1 initially had no recommendation but later submitted four names, including Mr. Kamakawiwoole's
- 6 nominated Mr. Kamakawiwoole

It deserves mention that those who either made no recommendation or nominated people other than Mr. Kamakawiwoole are staff who, for the most part, have either resigned or have indicated that they would not participate in the program next year.

Finally, Regent Chang objected to the fact that he had seen no written statement setting out the dissenting viewpoints and my analysis of the situation as called for by the Faculty Handbook when there is widespread disagreement among the members of a department or when a dean does not accede to the prevailing

President Harlan Cleveland

-3-

May 18, 1972

view expressed. I don't interpret the results of the poll as an indication of widespread disagreement; and further, I did provide in my memorandum to Chancellor Takasaki an overview of the situation based on the results of the poll.

DE. Contois

David E. Contois
Dean

cc: Chancellor R. Takasaki